



2005 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

7-8-2005

Sabo v. Metro Life Ins Co

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2005

Recommended Citation

"Sabo v. Metro Life Ins Co" (2005). *2005 Decisions*. 882.
https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2005/882

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2005 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 04-2829

IN RE: METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY
SALES PRACTICE LITIGATION

RICHARD P. SABO; RONALD COULTER; ANISSA COULTER, his wife; TAMMI BAZY; MICHELLE BLUM; BETH RAIBLE; SHELLEY DAUGHENBAUGH; FRIEDA KAMEL; PATRICIA FREY; CHRISTOPHER CLANCY; JOYCE MCCANDLESS; DIANA JOHNSON; ROBERT HEMCHER; GERALD DEARMITT; ADA DEARMITT, his wife; ANGELO RECUPERO, Residents of Pennsylvania, on behalf of themselves and all persons similarly situated; THOMAS ROSTEK and; JOANN ROSTEK, his wife, guardians for JENNIFER MARIE ROSTEK, a minor; NATHAN BENNETT, guardian for NATHAN BENNETT, JR. and, a minor; RUSSELL GONDER and; PAMELA GONDER, his wife, guardians for CORY GONDER, a minor, on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated; JOSEPH KILHOF; MARY KILHOF; ALBERT GIBBS; YVONNE GIBBS; STEPHANIE GIBBS, their daughter, as Policyholders of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; NORMAN J. MILLER; ROSE MILLER, his wife, as Policyholders of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; LOUIS MEROLLI, as Policyholder of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; JESSIE JONES; KENNETH WOLBERT, Individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated; JUANITA I. CASKEY, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; KRISTEL M. DAVIS; HARVEY J. WILLIAMS; DENNIS W. BIGGS, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; RICHARD L. ODDI, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; TIMOTHY A. MOHNEY; GAY N. MOHNEY; JEFFREY A. MOHNEY; AMANDA MARIE MOHNEY, a minor, by TIMOTHY A. MOHNEY, guardian; JOSEPH P. GARRETT, JR., on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated; DOUGLAS SMITH; CHARLES V. AMODEO, on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated; ROOSEVELT BARDEN, JR., individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; ALBINO A. GABRIELE; CAROLYN STONE; LUTHER STONE; JOSEPH CORRIERE; DONNA CORRIERE; BRENDA LOGUIDICE; MARY CHASTANG; RAYMOND ROSER; LUIS G. AMIONE, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; CLAIRE A. FALKIN; GARY L. FALKIN; RICHARD B. FALKIN; STUART R. FALKIN;

BERMON WHITT; MICHAEL A. RANKIN; TIEN QUANG NGUYEN, M.D.;
NGUYEN FAMILY LIFE TRUST; PHONG QUANG NGUYEN, and Trustee;
NGUYEN FAMILY LIFE INSURANCE TRUST; ELMER T. ANTHONY; PAULA K.
ANTHONY; WILLIAM HARVEY; ARTHUR E. LEACH; RONALD R. HESS

v.

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY; GARY ANTONINO; JOEL
SHERMAN; RONALD SHRAM; UNITED FOOD COMMERCIAL WORKERS
INTERNATIONAL UNION, AFL-CIO, CLC; BRUCE A. REZNIK ASSOCIATION;
METROPOLITAN INSURANCE & ANNUITY; JEFFREY J. RODGERS; ROBERT
MARTINI; JONATHON HOLLY, a Resident of Texas; JAMES D. SPANGLER;
STEVEN ANASTASIA; THOMAS M. HYLAND; CHRISTINE DOVAN; JACK E.
DUCKWORTH

*Helen M. Pennick and Margaret M. MacLean,
Appellants

*(Pursuant to Rule 12(a), F.R.A.P.)

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. No. 96-mc-00179)
District Judge: The Honorable Donetta W. Ambrose

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
June 27, 2005

Before: NYGAARD, SMITH, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

(Filed: July 8, 2005)

OPINION OF THE COURT

NYGAARD, Circuit Judge.

Having considered the record and the parties' briefs, we will affirm, essentially for the reasons stated by the District Court in its order dated May 27, 2004. Specifically, we find the injunction against the state court proceedings to be justified under the "protect or effectuate its judgments" exception to the Anti-Injunction Act. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2283.
